IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA NORTHERN DIVISION

JERRY ALAN WALKER, #208 534,)	
Plaintiff,)	
V.)	CASE NO. 2:17-cv-869-ECM
SGT. ANTHONY LAMBERT,)	[WO]
Defendant.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff, a prison inmate, filed this complaint on December 29, 2017. On January 9, 2018, the court directed Defendant to file an answer and written report addressing Plaintiff's claims for relief. In compliance with the court's order, Defendant submitted an answer and written report on May 10, 2018 and a supplemental written report on June 8, 2018, along with relevant evidentiary materials refuting the allegations in the complaint. Docs. 13, 22 & 31. Upon review of these materials, the court issued an order directing Plaintiff to file a response to Defendant's answer and written report, as supplemented. Doc. 23. The order advised Plaintiff that his failure to respond to the reports would be treated by the court "as an abandonment of the claims set forth in the complaint and as a failure to prosecute this action." Doc. 23 at 1. The order "specifically cautioned [Plaintiff] that [his failure] to file a response in compliance with the directives of this order" would result in the dismissal of this civil action. Doc. 23 at 1.

The time allotted to Plaintiff for filing a response in compliance with the directives of the court's June 21, 2018 order, as extended by orders entered July 17, 2018 and August 1, 2018, expired on August 21, 2018. As of the present date, Plaintiff has failed to file a response in

opposition to Defendant's written report. The court, therefore, concludes this case should be dismissed.

The court has reviewed the file to determine whether a measure less drastic than dismissal is appropriate, but concludes that dismissal is the proper course of action. Plaintiff is an indigent individual so the imposition of monetary or other punitive sanctions against him would be ineffectual. And Plaintiff's inaction in the face of Defendant's reports and evidentiary materials refuting his claims suggests he does not seek to proceed with this case. It, therefore, appears that any additional effort by this court to secure his compliance would be unavailing. Consequently, the court concludes that Plaintiff's abandonment of his claims and his failure to comply with an order of this court warrant dismissal. *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (holding that, as a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion); *see also Tanner v. Neal*, 232 F. App'x 924 (11th Cir. 2007) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal without prejudice of inmate's § 1983 action for failure to file an amendment to complaint in compliance with court's prior order directing amendment and warning of consequences for failure to comply).

For these reasons, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be DISMISSED without prejudice.

It is further ORDERED that **on or before November 2, 2018**, the parties may file an objection to the Recommendation. A party must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made; frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered.

Failure to file a written objection to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) shall bar a *de novo* determination by the District Court of legal and

factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waives the right of a party to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. 11th Cir. R. 3-1; *Resolution Trust Co. v. Hallmark Builders, Inc.*, 996 F.2d 1144, 1149 (11th Cir. 1993); *Henley v. Johnson*, 885 F.2d 790, 794 (11th Cir. 1989).

DONE on this 19th day of October, 2018.

GRAY M. BORDEN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE